

REMARKS

Claims 44-63 are pending and rejected by the examiner. Claims 44, 53 and 55 are independent claims.

The examiner rejected claims 44 and 53-63 as being vague for reciting a system.

Applicants cannot find the word "system" in claims 44 and 55-63. Applicants have, however, amended claims 53 and 54 to more distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. No new matter has been added.

Claim 44 recites "alert engines." Referring to applicants' specification and with reference to FIG. 1A, "...the alert engines 20, 20', 20" analyze the market event messages, received from the line handlers 18, 18' to determine whether alert conditions exist. If one of the alert engines 20, 20', 20" detects an alert condition, it transmits an alert message to the alert dispatchers 22, 22'. Each alert dispatcher 22, 22' coordinates sending of received alert messages to the analyst stations 36, 36', 36" for processing by an external user (not shown). These transfers of alert messages proceed via the two networks 24, 35." (specification page 10, lines 3-11)

Claims 44 and 55 recite "publishing the validated market event object entry in a sender object to a plurality of alert engines," or similar language. To publish is to make known. In the context of the quoted claim feature, the validated market event object entry in a sender object is made known to a plurality of alert engines.

In claims 50 and 61, the validated market event object entry in a sender object is made known through a private network.

Accordingly, applicants use of "alert engines" and "publishing" are proper under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Applicants' amended claims 55-63 to call for "a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, for line handling, the computer program product being operable to cause data processing apparatus to:"

Accordingly, claims 55-63 recite statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The examiner continues to use Wilson, Zusman, Kampe and Lange to reject claims 44-63 as having been obvious.

As discussed in a previous response, independent claims 44, 53 and 55 recite “a receiver object, a timing object, a translator object, a market event object, a queue object and a sender object,” or similar language.

None of the cited references teach or suggest at least the quoted features of applicant's claimed invention as claimed in claims 44, 53 and 55. For example, Wilson teaches a gateway for transfer of information between financial markets and customers. Wilson discloses no objects whatsoever.

Zusman teaches central ticker plant system for distributing financial market data that receives ticker feed data from many exchanges throughout the world, processes and formats the received data and then distributes or broadcasts the data to regional customers in the form of securities transactional data denoting the security identity and related transactional data. Zusman discloses no objects whatsoever.

Kampe teaches a selective call device having a receiver for receiving a selective call signal including an address. An address correlator coupled to a decoder determines that the selective call signal is directed thereto and determines whether the selective call signal includes an update command. The update command includes a major version number, topic numbers associated with sub-message(s) stored in the selective call device, update data associated with each topic number for updating the sub-messages, and minor version numbers associated with each topic number. The major version number is incremented when a sub-message template is changed. Minor version numbers are incremented after each update. The selective call device updates a sub-message with update data only if the update command includes a current major version number and an incremented minor version number. Kampe discloses no object whatsoever.

Eustis teaches sequencers and format registers that create variable length digital data signal fields and associated field attributes, both with the fields and operations performed on the fields in a random access memory with a central processing unit having comprehensive

processing capability, including arithmetic, field and record looping, compare, move and jump, look-up and disk read/write functions, I/O keyboard, display, print types of processing. Eustis discloses no object whatsoever.

Lange teaches the use of object-oriented programming to provide methods and systems for trading and investing in groups of demand-based adjustable-return contingent claims, and for establishing markets and exchanges for such claims. More specifically:
As depicted in FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, the architecture conforms to a distributed Internet-based architecture using object oriented principles useful in carrying out the methods of the present invention. (Col. 87, lines 33-35)

But Lange fails to teach or suggest the objects of applicant's quoted features. On the contrary, Lange merely teaches "an Object Request Broker (ORB) 230 can be a workstation computer operating specialized software for receiving, aggregating, and marshalling service requests from the software application server 210." (Col. 89, lines 18-21). Applicant's claimed invention calls for "receiving a message in a receiver object..., attaching timing data from a timing object..., activating a translator object..., assigning the market event object to an entry in a queue object, validating the market event object entry, and publishing the validated market event object entry in a sender object to a plurality of alert engines."

Thus, claims 44, 53 and 55 are not rendered obvious by Wilson, Zusman, Kampe and Lange, whether taken separately or in combination.

Further, claims 44 and 55 recite "publishing the validated market event object entry in a sender object to a plurality of alert engines," or similar language. None of the cited references teach, suggest or even mention this quoted claim feature.

The examiner argues that:

(s)ince the mechanisms to Wilson include processors that manipulate data, there are "engines present." Since data is disseminated there is present "publishing."

Applicants are bewildered by this reasoning, i.e., that the manipulation of data discloses engines while the dissemination of data discloses publishing. Wilson teaches no more than that a

translation/format interchange system referred to as a gateway. Wilson's gateway provides a method for "...the transfer of information between one or more customer system(s) which all utilize a common protocol and one or more financial market (exchange) system(s) which each utilize the same and/or different protocols that differ from the common protocol used by the customer system(s)." (col. 2, lines 51-54)

The system according to the present invention includes a gateway which receives and transmits transaction information from/to at least one customer system, receives and transmits transaction information from/to a plurality of markets (exchanges), and translates transaction information from a first protocol, i.e., format and/or language, into at least a second protocol and vice versa. (Wilson: col. 3, lines 8-14)

This is very As described above, publishing means to make known. Applicants' claims require making known the validated market event object entry in a sender object to alert engines. As clearly described in applicants' specification, the alert engines 20, 20', 20" analyze the market event messages, received from the line handlers 18, 18' to determine whether alert conditions exist. If one of the alert engines 20, 20', 20" detects an alert condition, it transmits an alert message to the alert dispatchers 22, 22'.

There no alert conditions in Wilson, or any of the cited references, and so there is no need to make the alert conditions known to alert engines.

Accordingly, claims 44 and 55 are not rendered obvious by Wilson, Zusman, Kampe and Lange, whether taken separately or in combination.

Lastly, applicants' claim 53 recites "a sender object to send the validated market event object entry to a plurality of alert engines."

None of the cited references teach, suggest or even mention alert engines. Accordingly, claim 53 is not rendered obvious by Wilson, Zusman, Kampe and Lange, whether taken separately or in combination.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above

Applicant : Ana Gabriela Anaya
Serial No. : 09/346,719
Filed : July 2, 1999
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 09857-018001

may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a \$430 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 1, 2004

Kenneth F. Kozik
Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906